

CITY OF MESA

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING

Held in the City of Mesa Council Chambers

Date: July 15, 2009 Time: 4:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Frank Mizner, Chair
Randy Carter, Vice Chair
Beth Coons
Chell Roberts
Vince DiBella

MEMBERS ABSENT

Scott Perkinson (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Debbie Archuleta
Gordon Sheffield
Jeff McVay

Christine Zielonka
Margaret Robertson
Desirae

Pat Gilbert
Charles Huellmantel
Tom Verploegen
Tyler Wright
Al Lacanne

Chairperson Mizner declared a quorum present and the meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The meeting was recorded on tape and dated July 15, 2009. Before adjournment at 5:40 p.m., action was taken on the following:

It was moved by Boardmember Carter seconded by Boardmember Coons that the minutes of the June 16, 2009, study session and be approved as submitted. Vote: 4 – 0 – 1 (Boardmember Roberts abstained)

It was moved by Boardmember Coons seconded by Boardmember Roberts that the minutes of the June 17, 2009 study session and regular meeting be approved as submitted. Vote: 5 – 0

Consent Agenda Items: All items identified with an asterisk (*) were approved with one Board motion.

It was moved by Boardmember Carter, seconded by Boardmember Coons that the consent items be approved. Vote: 5 – 0

Text Amendment: Amending Titles 2 and 11

Zoning Cases: Z09-14, Z08-62, GPMinor09-02, Z09-08

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z09- 14 (District6)** 1101 South Ellsworth Road. Located on the northeast corner of Ellsworth Road and Southern Avenue (69± acres). District 6. Site Plan Modification. This will allow the development of recreational amenities accessory to an existing recreational vehicle park in the R-4 and C-2 district. Ivy Foundation, owner; Charles Huellmantel, applicant.

Comments: This case was placed on the consent agenda and therefore was not discussed individually.

It was moved by Boardmember Roberts, seconded by Boardmember Carter

That: The Board recommend to the City Council approval of zoning case Z09-14 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan.
2. Provision of landscape quantities and sizes consistent with current Code requirement within the perimeter landscape setbacks for the new recreation area.
3. Site plan approval of all future development on the undeveloped portion of the site plan.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.

Vote: Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Perkinson absent)

Reason for Recommendation: The Board felt this proposal was reasonably well-designed and should be compatible with the adjacent neighborhoods.

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z08-62 (District 6)** 8260 East Baseline Road. Located west of the Loop 202 and north of Baseline Road (14.5± acres). Rezone from AG (conceptual M-1, C-2, R-2, and R-3) to R-4. This request will allow the zoning for high-density residential development. Loren & Colette Jessen; Jessco Dev. LLC, owner; Sean Lake; Pew and Lake, PLC, applicant.

Comments: The applicant has requested the case be tabled. Chairperson Mizner clarified that tabling a case means it will be re-advertised.

It was moved by Boardmember Roberts, seconded by Boardmember Coons

That: The Board table case Z08-62 as requested by the applicant:

Vote: Passed 5 – 0 (Boardmember Perkinson absent)

* * * * *

Note: Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.cityofmesa.org

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: . **GPMInor09-02 (District 6)** 10617 East Oasis Street. Located west of Signal Butte Road and south of Broadway (4.9± acres). Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Parks (P) to High Density Residential 10-15 du per acre (HDR 10-15). This case will allow the development of a Supportive Housing Project. MARC Center owner; Saemisch DeBella Architects, applicant.

Comments: Boardmember DiBella abstained from the discussion. Pat Gilbert represented the case. Mr. Gilbert explained that MARC Center has been operating on this site since 1984 when the County asked them to provide a facility for clients in East Maricopa County. The facility would be unique in that it would provide special needs for people in their 30's and 40's who's parents are no longer able to care for them, as well as providing separate housing for their parents, as well as low income elderly. Mr. Gilbert stated the adjacent neighbors had concerns regarding increased traffic. The applicants had a traffic study done which showed there would actually be fewer trips generated than there were from the current assembly use. Mr. Gilbert stated there would be 68 units. He stated the projects had been designed for special needs clients.

Staffmember Tom Ellsworth stated the request would change the General Plan from parks to High Density Residential. He stated that the annexation and rezoning were scheduled to occur at the same City Council meeting.

In response to a question from Boardmember Carter Mr. Gilbert stated the 811 funded project was scheduled to break ground February 1, 2010 and be completed in a year. The second phase or 202 project would probably start in February 2011.

Chair Mizner confirmed that the site had been part of the City of Mesa but was deeded back to the County as a park. The county had gone to the MARC Center and asked them to operate their programs from the site to meet the needs of parents in the east valley. He also confirmed that the site was in the process of being annexed. Mr. Gilbert stated the MARC Center would be bringing in a sewer line and infrastructure.

Boardmember Coons confirmed that the site had not been a park for many years. At least 10 to 15.

It was moved by Boardmember Coons, seconded by Boardmember Roberts

That: The Board recommend to the City Council adoption of zoning case GPMInor09-02 conditioned upon:

Vote: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 Boardmember DiBella abstained (Boardmember Perkinson absent)

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
5. Certificates of Occupancy and/or Completion for individual buildings shall not be

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

granted until Zoning Ordinance required parking and landscaping are constructed for those buildings.

6. All limits of construction shall have temporary landscaping, extruded curbs, and screen walls where parking and loading/service areas are visible from Rights of Way and public areas.

* * * * *

Note: Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.cityofmesa.org

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: **Z09-08 (District 6)** 10617 East Oasis Street. Located west of Signal Butte Road and south of Broadway (4.9± acres). Rezone from R1-9 to R-3 with a Site Plan Review; also consider the preliminary plat. This case will allow the development of a Supportive Housing Project. MARC Center owner; Saemisch DiBella Architects applicant.

Comments: Boardmember DiBella abstained from the discussion. Pat Gilbert represented the case. Mr. Gilbert explained that MARC Center has been operating on this site since 1984 when the County asked them to provide a facility for clients in East Maricopa County. The facility would be unique in that it would provide special needs for people in their 30's and 40's who's parents are no longer able to care for them, as well as providing separate housing for their parents, as well as low income elderly. Mr. Gilbert stated the adjacent neighbors had concerns regarding increased traffic. The applicants had a traffic study done which showed there would actually be fewer trips generated than there were from the current assembly use. Mr. Gilbert stated there would be 68 units. He stated the projects had been designed for special needs clients.

Staffmember Tom Ellsworth stated the request would change the General Plan from parks to High Density Residential. He stated that the annexation and rezoning were scheduled to occur at the same City Council meeting.

In response to a question from Boardmember Carter Mr. Gilbert stated the 811 funded project was scheduled to break ground February 1, 2010 and be completed in a year. The second phase or 202 project would probably start in February 2011.

Chair Mizner confirmed that the site had been part of the City of Mesa but was deeded back to the County as a park. The county had gone to the MARC Center and asked them to operate their programs from the site to meet the needs of parents in the east valley. He also confirmed that the site was in the process of being annexed. Mr. Gilbert stated the MARC Center would be bringing in a sewer line and infrastructure.

Boardmember Coons confirmed that the site had not been a park for many years. At least 10 to 15.

It was moved by Boardmember Coons, seconded by Boardmember Roberts

That: The Board recommend to the City Council adoption of zoning case Z09-08 conditioned upon:

1. Compliance with the basic development as described in the project narrative and as shown on the site plan and elevations submitted, (without guarantee of lot yield, building count, lot coverage).
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Design Review Board.
3. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
4. Dedicate the right-of-way required under the Mesa City Code at the time of application for a building permit, at the time of recordation of the subdivision plat, or at the time of the City's request for dedication whichever comes first.
5. Certificates of Occupancy and/or Completion for individual buildings shall not be granted until Zoning Ordinance required parking and landscaping are constructed for those buildings.
6. All limits of construction shall have temporary landscaping, extruded curbs, and screen walls where parking and loading/service areas are visible from Rights of Way and public areas.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Vote: Passed 4 – 0 – 1 Boardmember DiBella abstained (Boardmember Perkinson absent)

* * * * *

Note: *Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.cityofmesa.org*

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Discuss possible amendment to the Mesa City Code regarding titles 2 and 11 as they apply to the Planning and Zoning Board, Downtown Development committee, and Design Review Board.

Comments: Planning Director, John Wesley presented the proposed changes. He stated staff was looking at modifying the Downtown Development Committee, Planning and Zoning and Design Review processes. He stated the overall goal was to improve the process, ensure high quality development, and eliminate redundancy. The goal was to have one body looking at the whole City. He stated that with the changes in staff the Planning Division was now responsible for Historic Preservation and the Downtown area.

For the Design Review Board the proposed changes would be to have the Board meet four times a year to look at more detailed guidelines, to establish design review standards for unique areas of the City, to act as an appeal board, and approve City Projects. Staff was also looking at hiring a consultant architect to work with staff review cases. Applications would be taken once a week rather than once a month. Staff and the consultant architect would review the applications to determine which ones staff could review and which ones the architect needed to work on. Staff would be responsible for sending notices to adjacent property owners. Then if the applicant was not happy with the staff decision they could appeal to the Board. Larger, more difficult projects would be handled by the consultant architect who would work with the applicant directly. Staff would again be responsible for sending notification to adjacent property owners. This process would take 30 to 60 days to work through. The Design Review Board would then be free to work on establishing design standards for different character areas of the City; such as Dobson Ranch, Las Sendas, etc. There would be photos and pictures for applicants to review when developing in those character areas.

Chair Frank Mizner stated this was not a normal item for this Board. He also stated the City Council had discussed this issue at their June 4, 2009 study session. He encouraged the Board to watch the broadcast if they had not already. He stated these would be pretty fundamental changes for the City. He confirmed the Planning Division was already looking at historic areas. Gordon Sheffield then clarified that one role the Downtown Development Committee now has was to advise the City Council on redevelopment of downtown district. This duty would transfer to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Boardmember Chell Roberts asked for clarification on what consolidating all Planning and Zoning functions would mean. Mr. Wesley stated the same things the Board does now, but it would include the downtown area.

Boardmember Randy Carter questioned how eliminating the Design Review Board would ensure quality development. He did understand how consolidating the Downtown Development Committee could help because one Board would look at the whole City and keep a balance. Mr. Wesley stated the Design Review Board would look at design character of large areas.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated the Downtown Development Committee reviewed for zoning and design review. He confirmed there would still be two separate applications. He questioned how things like outdoor seating; vendors; signage will be handled with the proposed changes. Mr. Wesley stated that Planning staff would review those items. Mr. Sheffield then stated there are several applications that now go through the Downtown Development Committee and then to the Zoning Administrator, now they would only go to the Zoning Administrator.

Boardmember Beth Coons thought all applications for Planning and Zoning and Design Review

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

would run through the Planning and Zoning Board with one application. Mr. Wesley stated that they would still need to fill out a Design Review application and go through the staff review.

Boardmember Carter wondered why there needed to be two separate applications. Where is the public meeting where neighbors can come in to discuss the projects. He questioned why the Planning and Zoning Board was not reviewing for design. Mr. Wesley stated the direction being taken was to keep the processes separate. For one thing projects that did not need to go through the Planning and Zoning Board would be reviewed faster. As far as public involvement, they would be able to attend the meetings on design standards for character of areas.

Boardmember Roberts confirmed that Boardmember Carter was not asking that cases not be allowed to go through the zoning process until they had full architectural elevations. He also confirmed that any project could be taken to the Design Review Board as an appeal. He thought the public needs to have a meeting where they can speak if they want. He was concerned that a staff architect might try to imprint his own design style on what is being reviewed. This can be a problem in other communities. Staff would be a better option. He had concerns with how it was being set up. Mr. Wesley stated there would be three architects who would rotate. Overall guidelines would be established by the Design Review Board. The applicant could say they don't want a particular architect reviewing their project. Boardmember Carter asked why not the Planning and Zoning Board. Mr. Wesley stated that for one thing the public needs to realize that the zoning of the land stays even if the architecture of the buildings changes. If everything has to go through the Planning and Zoning Board it could slow down the process.

Boardmember DiBella thought the idea was for concurrent review, what would be the sequence of review; two separate applications; two separate noticing processes? He stated Mesa is the only community that has set dates for review. Applicants know that unless there are problems they will go to Planning and Zoning and Design Review two months after they submit applications. In other communities it takes many months before submittals are placed on an agenda. He did not think this revised process would speed things up. In fact he thought it would muddy the waters. He questioned how much property in Mesa doesn't have a site plan established. Mr. Sheffield stated that Site Plan Reviews were set after 1980. Boardmember DiBella stated there are a fair number of properties that would need to be reviewed. Staff would have to define "simple projects". He was concerned there would be a lot of sameness because applicants will design "safe projects" that meet the character guidelines instead of being creative.

Chair Mizner thought the goal for efficiency was good, but when economy turns around hiring contract planners would be different from contract plan reviewers. The Planning Division has lost their architects on staff. The contract architect would have potential conflicts with applicants. Why pay for contract architects when the Design Review Board has architects who volunteer their time on the Board. He also stated the Downtown Development Committee was established because of a sense that downtown was different, now they won't get special attention. The Design Review Board exists because the citizens voted for guidelines because they were not happy with the quality of development in Mesa compared to surrounding communities. When applicants know they are going to a public Board you get better quality design. He believes citizens are concerned with what buildings look like.

Mr. Wesley concluded by reminding the Board that staff will be presenting this same proposal to both the DDC and DRB in the near future. Actual Code amendments will be prepared and

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

presented to the Board at an upcoming Board public hearing for discussion and possible recommendation to the City Council.

* * * * *

Note: Audiotapes of the Planning & Zoning Board Meetings are available in the Planning Division Office for review. They are also “live broadcasted” through the City of Mesa’s website at www.cityofmesa.org

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2009 PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING

Item: Vision and Concept Plan for Downtown Mesa

Comments: Tom Verploegen of the Downtown Mesa Association stated the Association has been working on a vision for the original square mile for a year. He stated he was asking for input from various groups including the Downtown Development Committee, Parks and Recreation, Economic Development Advisory Board, staff and City Council. He stated he would be back at a later meeting with a detailed action plan. Mr. Verploegen stated there was a question as to whether the Concept Plan should be for just the original square mile or if it should be the entire 2 square mile redevelopment district. He asked the Board to read through the plan and comment.

Boardmember Coons stated the Planning and Zoning Board knew how important the downtown is to the City and citizens of Mesa. She thought this was a good time to work on the plan with the work on expanding the light rail into Downtown. She stated the Downtown is unique and has had a streamlined process. She did not want to see that change, she wanted the rest of the City to be streamlined.

Chair Frank Mizner asked Mr. Verploegen what his thoughts were on losing the Downtown Development Committee. Mr. Verploegen stated the Downtown Association was not taking a position. He stated his personal opinion was that it could be fine as long as the process was efficient and it would have to be sensitive to the uniqueness of the downtown. He thought the revisions to a Form Based Code would work better.

Respectfully submitted,

John Wesley, Secretary
Planning Director

DA:
I:\P&Z\P&Z 09\Minutes\7-15-09.doc